REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 69, 70 and 72-77 remain active in this case, Claims 69 and 70 having been amended by the present amendment, and Claims 1-69 and 71 having been previously canceled.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 69, 70, 72, 73 and 75-77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Kimura</u> (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0105279) in view of Tsuruoka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,414,443, hereinafter "<u>Tsuruoka</u>") and Claim 74 was rejected under35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Kimura</u> in view of <u>Tsuruoka</u> and in further view of <u>Kasai</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,989,826).

In light of the outstanding ground for rejection, Claims 69 and 70 have been amended to clarify the claimed invention, thereby to more clearly patentably define over the cited prior art. To that end, Claim 69 has been amended to clarify that the gradation voltage, which is supplied from the voltage generation section of the driving transistors, is applied so as to change gate voltages of the driving transistors in consideration of current/voltage characteristics of the driving transistors, respectively. (Applicant notes that the gradation voltage itself is not necessarily utilized as the gate voltage). Claim 70 has been amended to clarify that the gradation voltage which is supplied from said voltage generation section to said driving transistors, is applied so as to change gate voltages of said driving transistors according to temperature in consideration of current/voltage characteristics of said driving transistors, respectively. Support for the clarification to Claim 69 is provided, for example, in Applicants' published Application No. 20070132674, for example, at paragraphs [0324], [0331] and [0332], and also Figs. 12(a) and 12(b). Support for the clarification to Claim 70 is

provided, for example, in Applicants' published Application No. 20070132674, for example, at paragraph 19 and Fig. 10. No new matter has been added.

Thus, according to the claimed invention, even if the same voltage is supplied to the driving transistors, the currents flowing through the self-luminescent elements will be varied because of variations in the current/voltage characteristics of the driving transistors.

Accordingly, the relevant voltage is applied to change the gate voltage of the driving transistors in consideration of the current/voltage characteristics of the driving transistors, respectively, so that a current supplied to each of the self-luminescent elements may be controlled.

In view of the present amendments to Claims 69-70, it is believed that the outstanding grounds for rejection have been overcome, as the cited prior art does not appear to teach or suggest what is presently claimed.

For example, <u>Kimura</u> merely suggests a light emitting device which corrects voltage values supplied from a variable power supply to the pixel portion. Specifically, the source/drain voltage (<u>NOT</u> the gate voltage) of the driving TFT 111 is changed by simply using an ammeter 107 to measure the current flowing into the OLED 105. Accordingly, since the currents flowing through the OLED's will be varied because of variations in the current/voltage characteristics of the driving transistors, it is respectively submitted that <u>Kimura's</u> light emitting device fails to provide a uniform display unaffected by such variations in the characteristics of the driving transistors.

<u>Tsuruoka</u> merely discloses a simple matrix type display device, which does not use driving transistors.

<u>Kasai</u> only discloses a method for an electronic device comprising current-driven elements whose operation is controlled according to a current value of the current flowing through the element.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 69 and 70

patentably define over the art of record, as do and dependent Claims 72-77 which depend

from Claim 69.

Additionally, Applicant points out that, e.g., with respect to Claim 69, a temperature

sensing instrument form changing the voltage according to the temperature is not necessarily

required. Indeed, Fig. 138 shows a method that utilizes a precharge voltage generating circuit

1382, which is composed of one circuit, to vary the precharge voltage value without using the

temperature compensating element 1311 such as a thermistor. (It appears that Kimura's light

emitting device requires the ammeter 107, the current value comparing circuit 121 and the

power supply controlling circuit 122, separately).

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments,

the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome such that no further

issues are outstanding. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for

allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

is blandt brueter

MAJER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 08/09)

4146037_1.DOC

Eckhard H. Kuesters

Attorney of Record

Registration No. 28,870